REMARKS

Claim Status

After entry of this Amendment, Claims 1 and 5 – 7 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1 – 7 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Priority

The Examiner requests the Applicant to file priority documents. The Examiner explains that the application file contains a copy of European patent application 01 109 969.4 filed 04/24/2001, but no English translation of any portion of that application is provided. Applicant submitted a request for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) and a certified copy of the priority documents on March 8, 2004. Applicant submits herewith a certified translation of the priority document.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejects Claims 1 – 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite because, as to Claim 1, it is not clear whether "the individual peripheral unit" in line 9 is the same as, or different from "a peripheral unit" in line 8.

Claim 1 is amended, as set forth in the above listing of claims, to avoid the language that may have caused the asserted lack of clarity. According to Claim 1, first information units are communicated from at least one central unit to the buses and display units, and communication between the buses and display units is established via second information units. More particularly, the method of amended Claim 1 determines if one of the display units has previously received a key code transmitted with the first information unit, and if the previously received key code corresponds to another key code contained in the second information unit. That display unit processes a second information with priority if the previously received key code corresponds to the another key code contained in the second information unit. Fig. 2 and the corresponding description (e.g., page 6, lines 14 – 37) disclose one embodiment of a traffic control system. No new matter has been added.

In view of amended Claim 1 and the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

4

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects Claims 1 – 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehrig (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,358) in view of Felt (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,742). More particularly, as to Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Gehrig discloses a method for processing of information transmitted in a wireless communication between centers and peripheral units of a traffic control system, whereby first information units are communicated from at least one central unit to the peripheral units, and communication between individual peripheral units may be established for second information units, but does not teach processing a second information unit as a priority if the individual peripheral unit has previously received a key code transmitted with the first information unit and the key code corresponds to another key code contained in the second information unit. The Examiner cites Felt as disclosing an authentication method using password sets in which a password is provided to both a first party and a second party. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Felt with the traffic control system of Gehrig. The Examiner cites as motivation the desire to secure Gehrig's system from threats of unauthorized users as taught by Felt. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant notes that Gehrig belongs to the patent family of EP 0 797 818, which is cited and discussed in the background section of the present specification. In view of the prior art cited in the background section, the specification states the object of the invention is to provide a method that, while retaining the known infrastructure, enables prioritized processing of information. While the Examiner finds that Gehrig fails to disclose such prioritized processing, the Examiner does not discuss this limitation when referring to Felt, or when concluding that Claim 1 is obvious.

Felt is silent as to a prioritized processing of information when a certain condition is met, i.e., if the previously received key code corresponds to another key code contained in the second information unit, as defined in amended Claim 1. Felt authenticates the identity of a party involved in communicating over a network using the intersection of password sets. (Col. 1, lines 50 – 53.) Felt's method of authenticating the identity of a party, however, does not disclose or suggest a prioritized processing of information in the sense of the present invention.

5

Assuming for the sake of this discussion only that one of ordinary skill in the art were to combine Gehrig and Felt, e.g., to secure Gehrig's system from threats of unauthorized users as taught by Felt, Gehrig's peripheral units would be able to authenticate the identity of another party. Absent impermissible hindsight, the combination of Gehrig and Felt would not disclose or suggest what to do following a correct authentication of the identity. As stated above, amended Claim 1 defines that a display unit processes a second information with priority if the previously received key code corresponds to the other key code contained in the second information unit.

For these reasons alone, Applicant submits that the instant rejection of original Claim 1 is not justified over Gehrig in view of Felt. As discussed above, Applicant amends Claim 1 in response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Gehrig in view of Felt do not disclose or suggest the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and to pass amended Claim 1 to allowance.

Claims 2 – 7 depend from Claim 1. For this reason and because of the additional features recited in Claims 2 – 7, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2 – 7 are patentable over Gehrig in view of Felt. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass Claims 2 – 7 to allowance.

Summary of the Response

Applicant has responded to the rejections in the June 2, 2007 Office Action by amending the claims, as set forth in the above listing of claims, and presenting the above arguments. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 – 7 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw all rejections, and to pass this application to the issue process.

Request for Telephone Interview

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to the rejections raised in the Office Action so as to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number listed below in order to resolve such issues promptly.

6

Application No.: 10/684,382   2001P07203WOUS
                                                                    Alfons ZIEGLER

      Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to **Deposit Account No. 502464** referencing attorney docket number **2001P07203WOUS.** However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account

                                                                     Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/24/07

                                                      John P. Musone
                                                      Attorney for Applicant
                                                     Registration No. 44,961
                                                     Tel: (407) 736 6449
                                                     Customer No.: 28204

7

CERTIFICATION

I, Bryan Rodwell, a translator of the English and German languages, do hereby certify
the attached document to be a true copy of Priority Document EP 01109969.4.

Signed   B. Rodwell

Dated 21 September 2007